11th December 1923]

place on the 29th and 30th October last in company with the Sanitary Engineer and some municipal councillors, proposed a revised scheme. This has been referred to the Municipal Council for acceptance. The Sanitary Engineer is also being asked to submit estimates for the revised scheme.

(*c*) & (*d*) In December 1920, the Council applied for a grant of Rs. 22,691 equivalent to half the *increased* cost of the revised estimates for the scheme as it then stood and for a loan of a like amount with interest at 4 per cent per annum. The question of finance will have to be considered afresh when a decision has been arrived at on the scheme to be adopted. Ordinarily the Government bear one half of the cost of water-supply and drainage schemes and advance the other half as a loan, if the local body requires it.

RAILWAYS.

Scheme regarding Railway line between Singanallur and Podanur.

20 Q.—Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state if any scheme to divert the Railway line between Singanallur and Podanur so as to make it run *via* Coimbatore is in consideration; and if so, if there is any likelihood of the scheme being taken up at an early date?

A.—Yes. The matter is under correspondence with the Railway Board.

REVENUE ESTABLISHMENT.

Removal of the Revenue Divisional office, Gobichettipalayam.

21 Q.—Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state whether the proposal to remove the Revenue Divisional office from Gobichettipalayam is still under consideration and, if so, in what stage or whether it has been dropped?

A.—The proposal is under the consideration of Government and has not been dropped.

VILLAGE ESTABLISHMENT.

Pay of village officers.

22 Q.—Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) if there were village officers getting a salary of Rs. 15 a month before the introduction of the scheme to give village officers a minimum salary of Rs. 15 per mensem;

(*b*) if the answer to (*a*) be in the affirmative, the number of such officers and the reason that enabled them to receive a higher pay;

(*c*) whether the introduction of the new scheme of enhanced pay referred to in (*a*) has benefited in any way those village officers who were receiving not less than Rs. 15 per mensem; and

(*d*) if they have derived no benefit, whether the Government have any intention of taking their case into consideration and giving them any increase whatever?

[11th December 1923

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Four hundred and fifteen karnams and 19 headmen were in receipt of Rs. 15 and more each per mensem before the minimum pay of village officers was raised to Rs. 15 per mensem.

The comparatively large beriz, the size and the importance of the villages concerned account for the higher pay in the case of these officers.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) No.

The Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Bill.

22-A *Q.*—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI : Will the hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state whether his attention has been drawn to a leading article in the issue of the *Madras Mail* of Saturday the 8th December 1923, wherein it is stated that His Excellency the Governor is sending back to the Council the Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Bill for reconsideration on the hon. the Chief Minister's advice and whether the statement is correct ?"

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—" Sir, in sending the message to the Legislative Council about the Hindu Religious Endowments Bill, His Excellency the Governor decided to take the step in consultation with me and with my approval."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" May I know at what time the hon. the Chief Minister and his colleagues were consulted by His Excellency the Governor ? "

(No reply.)

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Sir, I would, with your permission, put another question since the previous question has not been answered. I should like to know from the hon. the Chief Minister as to when he was consulted by His Excellency the Governor with regard to the sending of the gracious message given yesterday. Again, Sir, I wish to know if the hon. the Chief Minister knew of this intention of His Excellency the Governor at the time the hon. the Chief Minister replied to the No-Confidence Motion in this House. Sir, I wish also to ask the hon. the Chief Minister whether, in view of the statement that he has now made and in view of the terms of the message of His Excellency, he still considers it consistent with the dignity of his office and the dignity of this Council that he ought to continue as Minister. "

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" Sir, I should like to put a few supplementary questions arising out of the answer given by the hon. the Chief Minister. I would like to know on what date the hon. the Chief Minister was consulted and on what date he gave his advice or expressed his approval That is very important and I do not think that is a supplementary question. . . ."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" If it is not a supplementary question, the hon. Member is out of order."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—" Sir, I was going to say 'which requires notice.' Because, this is a thing which must be within the personal knowledge of the hon. the Chief Minister and he owes it to this House that he should give a reply in such matters. That is my submission, Sir."